

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/080,933	ZHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner Jean B. Corrielus	Art Unit 2611	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Jean B. Corrielus(Examiner). (3) Luan C. Do, Reg. No. 38,434 (Applicant's rep.).
 (2) Jay Pate(SPE). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 May 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Jean B. Corrielus
JEAN B. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/22/07

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's rep. argues that the record is unclear since a new office action following the decision on the Pre-brief conference mailed on 1/10/07 has never been mailed. Examiner directs the applicant's rep. attention to the office action mailed on 10/31/06, page 1, that clearly states that prosecution is reopened based on the pre-appeal request on 9/15/06. Applicant's rep., however maintains that since the office action was mailed prior to the mailing of decision on the pre-brief conference, the office action dated on 10/31/06 should be remailed and any action following the mailing of the pre-brief decision should be vacated. Examiner and the examiner's supervisor agree to reopen prosecution and to vacate remail the office action mailed on 10/31/06, as per the applicant's rep. request.